



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/692,350

10/23/2003

Conor J. Cunningham

MSFT-2849/306818.1

8548

41505

7590

05/12/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)  
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/692,350	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CUNNINGHAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Cam Y T. Truong	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-14 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9-14 and 25 in the amendment filed on 7/28/2006. Claims 1-4, 5-7, 9-14, 25 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Murthy does not teach “a data store comprising a table of documents, each document having an associated document type in a hierarchy of document types, each document type being associated with a type path that is a path from a root document type to the document type in the hierarchy of document types and that is constructed as a function of the document type, the table comprising a plurality of entries representing the documents and their respective its associated type paths”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Murthy teaches the claimed limitations:

“a data store comprising a table of documents” as a database comprising a table of nodes (fig. 5, paragraph 0033),

“each document having an associated document type in a hierarchy of document types” as each node having a node type in a tree of node types (figs 3C, 4, [0030]);

“each document type being associated with a type path that is a path from a root document type to the document type in the hierarchy of document types and that

is constructed as a function of the document type” as each node type have a type path that is a path from the root node type to the node type in the hierarchy types (fig. 3C, [0030]),

“the table comprising a plurality of entries representing documents and their respective associated type paths” as table includes nodes as documents and its associated type path (figs. 4-5);

“a document retrieval system that accesses the table in the data store to determine, for each document, if its associated type path will satisfy the query, generates query results comprising each type path that satisfies the query” as accessing nodes (not documents) in the table corresponding to the path a.b.c.d and returns the value of those nodes. The following example Xpath expression searches the content(s) of one or more XML fragments corresponding to the location path /a/b/c/d. The value of those nodes are represented as query results that satisfies the query (paragraphs 0064-0069).

As explained above, Murthy teaches the above limitations.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 5-7 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 5 is dependent on claim 4 which is canceled. Thus, Examiner assumes that claim 5 is dependent on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

The term “that document” in claim 25 should be written as “said each document”.

The term “its” in claim 25 should be written as “said each document”.

The term "that element" in claim 25 should be written as "said each element".

The phrase "the hierarchy of document types" in claim 25 should be written as "a hierarchy of document types".

The term "configured to" in claims 1 and 25, suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. See also MPEP § 2111. 04.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-4, 5-7, 9-14, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The added limitations "creating a histogram over the pre-computed values, the histogram having a plurality of elements representing document types in the hierarchy of document types, encoding the query to describe one or more documents to retrieve based on an encoded query type, for each element of the histogram, determining whether the encoded query type is a prefix of the document type represented by the

Art Unit: 2162

element of the histogram, for each element of the histogram for which the encoded query type is determined to be a prefix of the document type represented by the element of the histogram, adding the associated quantity to a sum of matching elements, for each element of the histogram for which the encoded query is determined not to be a prefix of the document type represented by the element of the histogram, adding the associated quantity to a sum of non-matching elements, and generating the estimate of the selectivity of the query as a function of the sums of matching elements and non-matching elements" in the claim 25 are not provided in paragraph 0088, 0090-0092 of the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s).

The added limitation "type path" "that is constructed as a function of the document type" in claim 1 are not provided in paragraph 0075 of the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s).

Claims 2-4, 5-7, 9-14 are rejected under the same reason as discussed in claims 1 and 25.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3, 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy (US 20050055355) in view of Shadmon et al (or hereinafter "Shadmon") (US 20050033733).

As to claim 1, Murthy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a processor; a memory" as (paragraph 0033);

"a data store comprising a table of documents" as a database comprising a table of nodes (fig. 5, paragraph 0033),

"each document having an associated document type in a hierarchy of document types" as each node having a node type in a tree of node types (figs 3C, 4, [0030]);

"each document type being associated with a type path that is a path from a root document type to the document type in the hierarchy of document types and that is constructed as a function of the document type" as each node type have a type path that is a path from the root node type to the node type in the hierarchy types (fig. 3C, [0030]),

"the table comprising a plurality of entries representing documents and their respective associated type paths" as table includes nodes as documents and its associated type path (figs. 4-5);

"a document retrieval system that accesses the table in the data store to determine, for each document, if its associated type path will satisfy the query, generates query results comprising each type path that satisfies the query" as accessing nodes (not documents) in the table corresponding to the path a.b.c.d and

returns the value of those nodes. The following example Xpath expression searches the content(s) of one or more XML fragments corresponding to the location path /a/b/c/d. The value of those nodes are represented as query results that satisfies the query (paragraphs 0064-0069).

Murthy does not explicitly teach “wherein the document retrieval system is configured to determine, for each document, whether its associated type path contains one of a value specified by the query and a prefix of a value specified by the query”.

Shadmon teaches query processor can follow every path that looks like it might match the query. For example, A.fwdarw.(%)\*.fwdarw.C means "find every C that has an ancestor tagged A." To answer this query, the processor starts by using the prefix key lookup operator to search for the A prefix, and then follows every child of the A prefix node to see if there is a C tag somewhere below. Alternatively, the general prefix key lookup operator could return all children of the A prefix (paragraph 0284). When a request is submitted to the system, and after processing the request, the system returns data or references to the data that match the request (paragraph 0041).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Shadmon’s teaching of return data that match the request and return all children of the A prefix that match the request to Murthy’s system in order to provide a technique which facilitates text search, path search and browsing in semi-structured documents in general quickly.

As to claim 3, Murthy teaches the claimed limitation “wherein a document type



can be a subtype of another type” as (fig. 4)

As to claim 5, Murthy teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the data store comprises a computed column for storing each type path” as (page 2, [0024]).

As to claim 6, Murthly teaches the claimed limitations “ wherein each type path comprises a variable-length encoded value” as (page 3, [0026]).

As to claim 7, Murthy teaches the claimed limitations” wherein each variable-length encoded value corresponds to a hierarchy level of the document type of the associated document” as (page 3, paragraph [0026, 0030]).

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy in view of Shadmon and further in view of Chau et al (or hereinafter “Chau”) (US 6643633).

As to claim 2, Murthy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein each type is a user-defined type (UDT)”. Chau teaches user defined types (col. 8, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Chau’s teaching of UDT to Murthy’s system in order to provide powerful user-defined function to store and retrieve XML documents in XML columns as well as to extract XML element/attribute values.

9. Claims 1, 3, 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy (US 20050055355) in view of Uppala (US 6279007).

As to claim 1, Murthy teaches the claimed limitations:

"a processor; a memory" as (paragraph 0033);

"a data store comprising a table of documents" as a database comprising a table of nodes ( documents) (fig. 5, paragraph 0033),

"each document having an associated document type in a hierarchy of document types" as each node (document) having a node type in a tree of node types (figs 3C, 4, [0030]);

"each document type being associated with a type path that is a path from a root document type to the document type in the hierarchy of document types and that is constructed as a function of the document type" as each node type have a type path that is a path from the root node type to the node type in the hierarchy types. The node is not document (fig. 3C, [0030]),

"the table comprising a plurality of entries representing documents and their respective associated type paths" as table includes nodes as documents and its associated type path (figs. 4-5).

"a document retrieval system that accesses the table in the data store to determine, for each document, if its associated type path will satisfy the query, generates query results comprising each type path that satisfies the query" as accessing nodes (not documents) in the table corresponding to the path a.b.c.d and

returns the value of those nodes. The following example Xpath expression searches the content(s) of one or more XML fragments corresponding to the location path /a/b/c/d. The value of those nodes are represented as query results that satisfies the query (paragraphs 0064-0069).

Murthy does not explicitly teach “wherein the document retrieval system is configured to determine, for each document, whether its associated type path contains one of a value specified by the query and a prefix of a value specified by the query”.

Uppala teaches table 11C storing documents and returning all children as results that are a certain depth from their parents (col. 11, lines 40-50)

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Shadmon’s teaching of return data that match the request and return all children of the A prefix that match the request to Murthy’s system in order to provide a technique which facilitates text search, path search and browsing in semi-structured documents in general quickly.

As to claim 3, Murthy teaches the claimed limitation “wherein a document type can be a subtype of another type” as (fig. 4)

As to claim 5, Murthy teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the data store comprises a computed column for storing each type path” as (page 2, [0024]).

As to claim 6 , Murthly teaches the claimed limitations “ wherein each type path

comprises a variable-length encoded value” as (page 3, [0026]).

As to claim 7, Murthy teaches the claimed limitations” wherein each variable-length encoded value corresponds to a hierarchy level of the document type of the associated document” as (page 3, paragraph [0026, 0030]).

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murthy in view of Uppala and further in view of Chau et al (or hereinafter “Chau”) (US 6643633).

As to claim 2, Murthy does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “wherein each type is a user-defined type (UDT)”. Chau teaches user defined types (col. 8, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Chau’s teaching of UDT to Murthy’s system in order to provide powerful user-defined function to store and retrieve XML documents in XML columns as well as to extract XML element/attribute values.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### **Contact Information**

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162